



Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

Fwd: Opposition to Venice BID & Relevant Questions

1 message

Mike Bonin <mike.bonin@lacity.org>

Mon, Aug 1, 2016 at 11:15 PM

To: Debbie DynerHarris <debbie.dynerharris@lacity.org>

MIKE BONIN*Councilmember, 11th District**(213) 473-7011**www.11thDistrict.com**twitter: @mikebonin**www.Facebook.com/MikeBoninCD11*

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **MaryAnn Dill**

Date: Mon, Aug 1, 2016 at 10:39 PM

Subject: Opposition to Venice BID & Relevant Questions

To: mike.bonin@lacity.org

Cc: Mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, Holly.Wolcott@lacity.org, Councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, Councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, Councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, Councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, Councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, Councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, Councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, taylor.bazley@lacity.org, tricia.keane@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Bonin and other City leaders,

RE: CF 16-0749 (CD 11)

I am writing to strongly oppose the establishment of a Venice Business Improvement District at this time.

I urge you, at a minimum, to postpone the final vote by the LA City Council on August 23

to give those directly and indirectly affected an opportunity to learn what a BID is and to meet with you next week or as soon as possible.

I have lived or worked in Venice since 1975, for many years I did both.

My husband Guy Dill has been in Venice since his art school days in the late 60s.

His studio which he built in 1987 is on Innes Place, a two block long street between Pacific and Main and Westminster on the north and Market on the south.

There is absolutely no commercial activity at all on Innes Place.

We were outraged to receive a BID proposal that is assessing our property for over \$9,000. in addition to our property taxes for services that we do not want or need or agree with.

It is a huge financial burden for us and something that we have never heard about, and have never had a voice in. It is very clearly taxation without representation. It appears to have been put together secretly by a group of large landowners and developers who stand to gain by forcing us to financially support their vision of Venice. This is unacceptable in every way.

There was no democratic process or input from the neighborhood that was unwillingly drafted into the BID.

Why weren't the majority of property owners that are expected to pay for the BID included in discussions from the onset.

The BID petition materials that were sent out were misleading. We weren't informed that the city had already committed 25% of the votes supporting the BID making it an unfair ballot process from the very beginning. I have been hearing from different neighbors and Venice residents that BID proponents were at the recent city council meeting last week talking about how the BID is 'already done' and they expect to have funding in place by next spring. 'Already done' with the vote still three weeks away. How is that possible?

The city should refrain from voting on this BID. It is clearly a conflict of interest and unfairly weights the vote toward BID passage. The city property was gerrymandered into this and it's questionable if it can be justified as the best use of public resources and revenues. Venice Blvd. is parking lots, no businesses. The dog park and empty bus depot have no businesses. Why would they be included in and paying for a business district? How is this legal?

The BID is intended to clean up Ocean Front Walk and the area around Google. Those property owners deserve better service from the city, especially with the amount of property taxes that are being collected in Venice these past years. It is however completely unfair to put this burden on the other property owners who are unaffected by problems on the Boardwalk, as the vast majority of services will go to those areas. I believe it is privatizing the benefits while socializing the costs.

We are strongly against the creation of a private police force on the Boardwalk or anywhere else in Venice.

I ask that you postpone the scheduled vote, meet with a group of us and establish a public process to engage the entire Venice community before any further action is taken on this proposal.

Also, is it true that two of the main proponents of this BID and listed as signers, are Carl Lambert, immediate past president of the Venice Chamber of Commerce and his predecessor as Chamber president, Andy Layman. On June 22, City Attorney Mike Feuer filed a civil case against Lambert and Layman, both Venice "owners and operators of apartment buildings each subject to the City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO), alleging that the property owners are illegally operating and advertising as hotels."

There is so much money in Venice now and so many competing interests. We need to know exactly what the parameters are for this BID. Who and what organization will be administering and managing this very large budget. It is an indication of a troubling dynamic in Venice business and politics that Mr. Lambert has a leading role in the BID process. He has turned 5 entire apartment buildings in Venice into de facto hotels. These are the very people who stand to benefit most from this privatization. This is not the time to endorse this proposal.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

MaryAnn Dill

Venice 90291

